

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

-----X

TANVIR AMNA,  
Plaintiff,

**ORDER**  
**08 CV 2806 (CBA)(LB)**

- against -

NEW YORK STATE DEPARTMENT OF  
HEALTH, THE STATE OF NEW YORK,

Defendant.

-----X  
**BLOOM, United States Magistrate Judge:**

By letter dated July 15, 2010, plaintiff requests the Court's assistance to obtain discovery from defendant. The Court construes plaintiff's request as a motion to compel under Fed. R. Civ. P. 37(a). Defendant opposes plaintiff's request, noting that discovery closed in this action on March 15, 2010, and that plaintiff has had ample opportunity for discovery. The Court agrees and plaintiff's motion to compel is denied.

The Court extended the discovery deadline on multiple occasions in this case, due in part to plaintiff's dismissal of her attorneys and the large volume of discovery plaintiff sought. The parties were ordered to produce initial disclosures on December 4, 2008, and the Court ordered the parties to complete all discovery by April 15, 2009. The Court extended the discovery deadline to July 29, 2009 after plaintiff instructed her first attorney to withdraw. Docket entry 25. When on October 2, 2009 plaintiff notified the Court that she had not received responses to her discovery demands, the Court extended the discovery deadline to January 15, 2010, and ordered both parties to produce their responses to any outstanding discovery. By this time, plaintiff had terminated her second attorney, docket entry 39, and the Court noted that its extension of the discovery deadline was final "regardless of whether plaintiff retains another attorney or proceeds *pro se*." Docket entry 41.

However, by letter dated December 2, 2009, plaintiff stated that while she received responses to her discovery demands, they were "severely deficient," docket entry 45. Further, on January 5, 2010, defendant requested an extension of the discovery deadline in part because plaintiff had obtained new counsel who had served supplemental discovery demands. Docket entry 51. Thus, the Court granted an extension to March 15, 2010, but warned the parties that "[n]o further requests for an extension of the discovery deadline from either side shall be considered." Id. Indeed, on February 18, 2010, the Court held a telephonic conference to address the parties' latest discovery dispute, directed the parties to work with each other, and denied the parties' request for another extension of the discovery deadline to April 15, 2010. Docket entries 52 and 53. The parties informed the Court later in the day on February 18, 2010 that they had resolved the disputed issue. Docket entry dated February 18, 2010.

Plaintiff's instant motion complains that her terminated attorneys did not pursue all the discovery requests she believes she needs. She attaches letters she sent to the defendant's attorney dated January 3, 2009, November 19, 2009, November 30, 2009, December 21, 2009 as well as new demands she sent to defendant's counsel on July 30, 2010.

Discovery in this action is closed. Plaintiff has had ample opportunity to conduct discovery. Plaintiff's July 15, 2010 letter request is denied. Plaintiff shall serve her opposition to defendant's motion for summary judgment on defendant by August 23, 2010 or the Court shall consider the motion unopposed.<sup>1</sup>

SO ORDERED.

/S/  
\_\_\_\_\_  
LOIS BLOOM  
United States Magistrate Judge

Dated: July 23, 2010  
Brooklyn, New York

---

<sup>1</sup> Plaintiff is directed to focus her efforts on opposing defendant's motion for summary judgment, as any further effort to reopen discovery will not be considered.